

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2005. Claims 31-60 are pending in the Application and stand rejected. For the purposes of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends Claims 31, 38, 44, 51, and 56. Additionally, Applicant adds new Claims 61-90, which are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claim Rejections — 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects Claims 31-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,793,762 issued to Penners et al. ("Penners"). As amended, Claim 31 recites:

A method for supporting data communications comprising:

detecting, without receiving from a mobile unit a request to change foreign agents, that the mobile unit has entered a geographic area associated with a base transceiver station;

determining, in response to detecting that the mobile unit has entered the geographic area, a home agent for the mobile unit based on a device identifier of the mobile unit;

requesting subscription information from the home agent, wherein the subscription information comprises an internet protocol (IP) address for the mobile unit; and

initiating, by the base transceiver station, registration of a foreign agent with the home agent, wherein the foreign agent is associated with a foreign network, and wherein the registration permits the foreign agent to receive redirect packets from the home agent, the redirect packets containing information for communication to the mobile unit.

Penners fails to recite, either expressly or inherently, every element of Claim 31. For example, *Penners* fails to disclose "detecting, without receiving from a mobile unit a request to change foreign agents, that the mobile unit has entered a geographic area associated with a base transceiver station[.]" As the Examiner concedes, "mobile host registration sends DRPC registration message to RPC (Figure 1, element 20) each RPC equipped with foreign agent functionality (element 28)." *Final Office Action*, p. 2. Furthermore, the Examiner concedes that "*Penners* discloses registration is initiated by mobile host that desires to change foreign agent." *Advisory Action*, p. 2. More specifically, *Penners* indicates that:

In operation, registration is initiated by a Mobile Host (MH) 134 *that desires to change a Foreign Agent (FA) 136*. The sequence of registration messages is shown more particularly in FIG. 8 in conjunction with FIG. 7. The Mobile Host 134 sends a MH registration request 138, which includes the FA's internet address, obtained through network layer beaconing to the FA 136.

Col. 9, ll. 42-48, emphasis added.

Thus, *Penners* does not disclose "detecting, without receiving from a mobile unit a request to change foreign agents, that the mobile unit has entered a geographic area associated with a base transceiver station" as recited by Claim 31.

As a result, *Penners* fails to disclose every element of Claim 31. Claim 31 is thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 31 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 31, Claims 38, 44, 51, and 56 include elements that, for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 31, are not disclosed, either expressly or inherently, by the cited reference. Claims 38, 44, 51, and 56 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 38, 44, 51, and 56, and their respective dependents.

New Claims

Applicant adds new Claims 61-90, which are fully supported by the Application as original filed. *Penners* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of any of new Claims 61-90. For example, new Claim 61 recites:

A method for supporting data communications comprising:

detecting, without a mobile unit determining that the mobile unit has entered a geographic area associated with a base transceiver station, that the mobile unit has entered the geographic area associated with the base transceiver station;

determining, in response to detecting that the mobile unit has entered the geographic area, a home agent for the mobile unit based on a device identifier of the mobile unit;

requesting subscription information from the home agent, wherein the subscription information comprises an internet protocol (IP) address for the mobile unit; and

initiating, by the base transceiver station, registration of a foreign agent with the home agent, wherein the foreign agent is associated with a foreign network, and wherein the registration permits the foreign agent to receive redirect packets from the home agent, the redirect packets containing information for communication to the mobile unit.

Penners fails to recite, either expressly or inherently, every element of new Claim 61.

For example, *Penners* fails to disclose “detecting, without a mobile unit determining that the mobile unit has entered a geographic area associated with a base transceiver station, that the mobile unit has entered the geographic area associated with the base transceiver station[.]” *Penners* teaches a system in which the radio port controller (RPC) relies upon the mobile unit to determine that the mobile unit has entered a geographic area associated with the RPC. Specifically, as *Penners* indicates:

FIG. 3 shows the registration procedures when a user roams from one registration area to another. A registration area in this architecture is restricted to one RPC. The mobile terminal (handset) *after recognizing a new preferred RPC signal*, sends a registration request (REQ 52) to the new RPC.

Col. 8, ll. 20-27.

Additionally, *Penners* states that “[a]s shown, when the handset moves into the new RPC area, it determines that it is better served by the new RPC. It then initiates hand-over via the new RPC by requesting a handover 112 while providing the new RPC with a DN provided by the old RPC.” Col. 9, ll. 18-2. Thus, *Penners* does not disclose “detecting, without a mobile unit determining that the mobile unit has entered a geographic area

associated with a base transceiver station, that the mobile unit has entered the geographic area associated with the base transceiver station" as recited by new Claim 61.

As a result, *Penners* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 61. Claim 61 is thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 61 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 61, Claims 68, 74, 81, and 86 include elements that, for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 61, are not disclosed, either expressly or inherently, by the cited reference. Claims 68, 74, 81, and 86 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 68, 74, 81, and 86, and their respective dependents.

Conclusion

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of the Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be currently due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Todd A. Cason
Reg. No. 54,020

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6452

Date: 10/21/05

Customer Number:

05073